FORM TO BE USED BY PRISONERS IN FILING A COMPLAINT UNDER THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT, 42 U.S.C. § 1983 18 186 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT for 186 SOUTHERN DISTRICT of GEORGIA

Willia	e Ch	umbers		
			CV314-1	20
(Enter abo	ve full n	ame of plainuff or plainuffs)		
٧.			CLE 70	.
	\	forth C - Tondare	ERK SO. C	S.D.
William .	n bar	storth, Sam Zanders, s, Barbara Grant,	SIG	
Jody		-	T. OF AM	
Joay	DIEW	Jar T		
(Enter abov	e full na	ame of defendant or defendants)	> / 2	
[. Pre	vious lav	vsuits		
Α.		e you begun other lawsuits in state or lved in this action?	federal court dealing with the Yes	
	than	ur answer to A is yes, describe each lav one lawsuit, describe the additional law coudings.)	vauit in the space below. (If the varies on another piece of papers.)	here is more er. using the
	1.	Parties to this previous lawsuit:		
•		Plaindiffs:		
	· :	Defendants:	·	
	2.	Court (if federal court, name the di	strict; if state court, name the	e county):
	3.	Docker number:		, ,
	4.	. Name of judge assigned to case:	·	

	5.	Disposition (for example, was the case dismissed? appealed? is it still pending?):
	6.	Approximate date of filing lawsuit:
	7.	Approximate date of disposition:
	8.	Were you allowed to proceed in forma pauperis (without prepayment of fees)? Yes No
В.		le incarcerated or detained in any facility, have you brought any lawsuits in ral court which deal with facts other than those involved in this action? Yes No
	than	ur answer to B is yes, describe each lawsuit in the space below. (If there is more one lawsuit, describe the additional lawsuits on another piece of paper, using the outline.)
	1.	Parties to previous lawsuit:
		Plaintiffs:
		Defendants:
	2.	Court (name the district):
	3.	Docket number:
	4.	Name of judge assigned to case:
	5.	Disposition (for example, was the case dismissed? appealed? is it still pending?):
	· 6.	Approximate date of filing lawsuit:

	7	_	+
	7.	Approximate date of disposition:	
	8.	Were you allowed to proceed in form fees)?	Yes
C.	paup	o any lawsuit filed in federal court where yours, was any suit dismissed on the ground to state a claim?	ou were allowed to proceed in fo d that it was frivolous, maliciou Yes No _
	i.	If your answer to C is yes, name the cou	urt and docket number for each of
Place	of prese	ent confinement:	
A.	is the	re a prisoner grievance procedure in this i	nstitution? Yes 🗸 No
B.	Did y	ou present the facts relating to your comintee?	aplaint to the appropriate grieve Yes No
C.	[f you	r answer to B is yes:	
	l.	What steps did you take? Upon know were violated I filed am to about the July the date of July	uledge that my rights or mal grievance on or y 7,2014.

		3.	Did you app administrativ	eal any adve ve procedure?	rse decision to	the highest lev	vel possible in the
	•	•	or about	was the result	? <u>brievence</u> 3,2014.	was furtho	rdomied an
	D.	lf you di	id not utilize	the prison gr	ievance procedi	ure, explain wh	y not:
ľV.	Partie	:3					
					plaintiff and cu ans an an anac		Provide the name
	A.	Name of Address:	plainuff:	Tolfair & P. O. Bo	Caco Chambotated Prison x 849 Seorgia 310°		1921b
		•	dress Provi		•	•	employment, and efendants in Item
	₿.	Position:	defendant mployment: idress:	Warde Tolfair P.O. Be	State Pris	·	
	C.	Doorty	Wardon of	: Deputy Caro and t. Jody S	Warder of S Froatment, Di tewart	ecurity, Sam Jann Doos; U	Zanders; nit Manager,

V. Statement of Claim

State here as briefly as possible the FACTS in your case. Describe how each defendant is personally involved in the depriving you of your rights. You must include relevant times, dates, places, and names of witnesses. DO NOT GIVE LEGAL ARGUMENTS OR CITE ANY CASES OR STATUTES. If you intend to allege a number of related claims, number and set forth each claim in a separate paragraph. (Use as much space as you need. Attach extra sheets if necessary.)

a prisoner of the Georgia Department of Corrections und authority and administration of the officials alleged horoi - their counterparts about the date of Nevember 22 2010 to a disciplinary hearing conducted by at Macon State Prison and a \$100 (one-hundred two processing fee was administered against the Plaintiff for being found quilty of D. R. (disciplinary report) charge DOSL - Possession Call Phone A A4 (love dollar) administrative procession D.K. # 161151 3. On or about the date of July 13, 2011 the Plain ed to a disciplinary heaving conducted by them Lt. Spires State Prison and a \$100 (machindred dollar) administrative procession Lee was administered against the Plaintiff for being of D. P. Charge DOZI - Possession of Call Phone. administrative processing tee wa 21824 was appealed at it was appealed to Inmote Alfairs and Ombudsman. Appeal donied Soptember 21, 2011 to a disciplinary houring conducted by

S. (cont.d) Lt. Barbara Grant, who is prosontly a Unit Manager, and \$100 (one-hundred dollar) administerative processing too was administered against the Plaintiff for being found guilty of D.R. chargo DOBL-Possession of Cell Phone. A #4 (four dollar) administrative processing fee was also administered for this D.R. # 336920.

6. The Plaintiff recieved the Disciplinary Appeal Form to D.R. # 336920 through institutional mail on October 29, 2012. Disciplinary Appeal Form was submitted alloging that a hearing was conducted outside of the Plaintiff's presence without him signing an appearance waiver. Also alleged was a violation of disciplinary S.D.P. which states (4) four hours after advocate investigation a hearing should be held, no sooner. No respon-So was forth coming regarding appeal of this D. R. Cornsolor Antionette Johnson was advocate. 7. On or about the date of October 30, 2012 a grievance was filed regarding the violation of Plaintiffs right to be present at his D.R. houring. Grievance was rejected October 31,

8. On or about the date of November 26,2012 a grievance was filed regarding the Plaintiffs appeal form not being returned. Grievance was rejected November 26, 2012.

4. On or about the date of March 1, 2013 the Plaintiff was subjected to a disciplinary hearing conducted by Lt. Judy Stowart in the prosonce of Chief Counselor Deondrick Clemen's and a #100 (one-hundred dollar) administrative processing too was administered against the Plaintiff For being found guilty of D.R. charge DO3L-Possession of Cell Phone. X #4 (four dollar) administrative processing fee was also administered for this D.R.# 369857.

10. D. R. # 369557 was appealed at the institutional level and denied, saying it had expired. Plaintill appealed further to Inmate Affairs and Ombudsman Unit and it was denied May 30, 2013, 11. On a about the date of July 7, 2014 the Plaintiff filed a grievance addressing misappropriation of private funds with this institution for administration of this \$100 (one-hudred dollar) administration of this \$100 (one-hudred dollar) administration of the state of the stat

trative processing fee here at Telfair State Prison and elsewhere Grievance was rejected Plaintiff appealed grievance to Inmute Affairs and Ombudsman Unit and they agreed with the rejection and denied Plaintiff's grievance as well.

12. The Plaintiff incorporates enumerations 1-11 and realleges these facts to support his claim that the administration of these (4) four \$100 (are-hundred dollar) adminis trative processing fees against the Plaintiff as asserted the Plaintiff's legal claim against the Defendants for deprivation of rights under color of law for theft, Fraud, racketboring extortion, suffered monetary Moss, montal anguish, emotional distress, duross,

and threat of prosecution.

13. Also, by the Plaintiff paying a \$44 (four dollar) administrative processing-fee for the D.R.s themselves and then being subjected to another \$100 (one-hundred dollar) processing fee for an intraction (DO3L) therein violates the Double Jeopardy clause of the ing fee for an intraction (DO3L) therein violates the Double Jeopardy clause of the

13 (cont.d) 5th Amondment of the U.S. Constitution. 14. The Plaintiff shows that it's furthermore fraudulent and illegal for the administration of this fee by the fact that in name of the D.R.s in which this fee was administered against the Plaintiff did he once get charged or found quilty of violating any U.S. Law or Statute (A-1) or any Georgia Law or Statute (A-2) to give them jurisdiction to pursue felony charges against the Plaintiff, the D.R. is a charging instrument like a presentment or indictment which must properly charge a person or it is doomed totally flawed. 15. The Constitution protects persons from Excessive Fines and Cruel and Unusual Punishments in the 8th Amendment and the Plaintiff is unaware of any warrant at law that costs \$100 (one-hundred dollars) making administration of such a fee excessive in this regard and this foo is a cruel and unusual punishment, for it's administration is unsupport ed by the law or the U.S. Constitution. There is no law, statute, order, rule, regulation, or procedure supported by the U.S. Constitution or the State of Georgia Constitution authorizing administration of a fine/fee imposed upon a person (in this case the Plaintiff) so that another (in this case the Defendants) may sook charges against that person unless that person has been duly convicted in a court of law of an offense, in which the person upon a finding of guilt will be undered to pay restitution.

16. Furthermore, Inmate Discipline S.O.P. II BOZ-0001 Section Q.C. States D.R. charged D-3(1)"is the charge that warrants administration of the \$100 (one-hundred dollar) fee and there is no such charge in the S.O.P.

17. As Warden of Telfair State Prison (T.S.P.), William Darrforth is liable for approxing the administration of this \$ 100 (one-hundred dollar) administrative processing too in violation of Plaintiffs rights in his official capacity and individual capacity for failing to rodress said violations which impose upon the Plaintiff a fee that misappropriates private funds recioved from outside sources as gifts. 18. As Doputy Wardon of Socurity at T.S.P., Sam Zunders is liable for overseeing the disciplinary process which administers these \$ 100 administrative processing foos thus, in his official capacity and Individual capacity ho bladardly approved and failed to correct the tortious actions being perpetrated against the Plaintiff through the misuppropriation of private funds recieved from outside sources as gifts. 19. As Deputy Wardon of Care and Troutment at T.S.P. Diann Does is liable for the redross of grievances at the institutional level. She has failed to correct the violetions

Case 3:14 DO 20 DHB & KE DOGSTON A Ded 11/04/14 Page 8 of 11

19. (cont.d) herein leading to a deprivation of rights under color of law in her official and individual capacities, for under hor care she has not prevented or attempted to provent the illegal treatment being inflicted upon the Plaintiff and other inmetes by imposition of fees that misappropriates private funds recieved from outside sources as gifts.

20. Unit Manager Barbara Grant is liable for her actions when she served as Disciplinary Heaving Officer and directly administered the \$100 administrative processing fee against the Plaintiff in her official and individual capacities which led to the deprivation of the Plaintiff's rights under color of law by imposing a fee upon the Plaintiff that misappropriates private funds illegally that he recioves from extende sources as a

921. Lt. Jody Stewart 1s liable for his actions when he served as Disciplinary Hearing Officer and directly administered the \$100 administrative processing fee against the Plaintiff in his afficial and individual capacities which look to a deprivation of rights under color of law by imposition of a fee which misappropriates private funds illegally that the Plaintiff recieves from oxiside sources as gifts.

22. Plaintiff horoin has no plain, adoquate or complete remody at law to redross the wrongs doscribed herein, the Plaintiff has been and will continue to be irreparably violated by these fortions actions of this administration and the defendants unless this court grants the relief sought by the Plaintiff.

VI. Relief
State briefly exactly what you want the court to do for you. Make no legal arguments. Cite no cases or statutes.
will be only with the
Whorefore, Plaintith respectfully prays that this court enter judge
ment:
1) Granting Plaintit Chambers a Doctaration that acts and omni
ssions described heroin violated his rights under the Constitu-
tion and the laws of the U.S., and;
2. A permanent injunction ordering Defondants Danforth,
Zandars Doss, Grant, and Stowart and their counterparts to
coase administering this illegal too which infringes upon in-
mates rights, and;
3. Grant Plaintiff Chambers componsatory damages in the
amount of \$40,000 (forty-thousand dollars) against Dofondar
Darforth Zandors, and Does, jointly and severally, and;
4. Grant Plaintiff Chambers componsatory damages in the
amount of \$10,000 (ten-thousand dollars) against Defendants
Grant and Stewart, jointly and soverally, and;
S. Plaintiff socks punitive damages in the amount of
#250,000 against Dotordants Danforth, Zunders, and Does
$oldsymbol{J}$
I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and contect.
Signed this day of 19
Prisoner No(Signature of Plaintiff)
(2) austria of Liemani

Case 3:14-CVENDINO HOLDER KENFO SEMENTICLE Filed 11/04/14 Page 10 of 11

I WILLIE CHAMBERS DO HEREBY SERVE THE FOREGOING CIVIL ACTION 42 U.S.C. 1983 PETITION BY PLACING SAID DOCUMENTS IN THE U.S. MAIL WITH SUFFICIENT POSTAGE AFFIXED TO ASSURE IT'S DELIVERY UPON THE FOLLOWING:

DEFENDANTS: William Danforth, Sam Zanders Diann Does, Barbara Grant, Jody Stewart Tolfair State Prison P.D. Box 549 Holong, 6a 31037

Substibod and signed by my hand 28 day of October 2014

Without Projudice UCC 1-207

EP.O. BON 549 Holon, Ca 31037 Edc#1149216 To Haln State Prison 16 Phumbor 900000000111E United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia BY CELL SOLD LANGE THE POST OF SEP